UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,223	08/04/2003	Chris Tengwall	12838/3	6507

26646 7590 09/14/2006

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER	
SHERKAT, AREZOO	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2131	

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/634,223	TENGWALL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arezoo Sherkat	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 July 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 August 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This office action is responsive to Applicant's amendment received on 7/6/2006. Claims 1, 10, 14-15, 24, and 26 are amended. Claims 39-43 are added. Claims 1-43 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Little does not teach "a relay arrangement configured to push data from behind a firewall arrangement to the at least one handheld wireless device such that the data is not stored outside of the firewall arrangement while enroute to at least one wireless carrier network".

Examiner responds that the operator infrastructure, specifically as shown in Fig. 9, is merely functioning as a bridge between the wireless network 811 and the LAN 807. ... in a pull-based system, a mobile device 813, 815 may establish a communication session with the network operator infrastructure 840 using a wireless network compatible communication network scheme, preferably a secure scheme such as WTLS or WAP browser ... a user may then request information stored in a mailbox 819, in a data store 817, inside the firewall 808 (i.e., note that data is never stored outside the firewall 808)(page 10, par. 84-88).

2. Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection communicated in the office action of April 13 2006 as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 9-18, and 22-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Little et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0171369 and Little hereinafter).

Regarding claims 1, 16-18, 34-38, and 42, Little discloses a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement to at least one handheld wireless device (i.e., mobile device 888 and 898) that receives data from a wireless carrier network (i.e., wireless networks 884 and 886), the system comprising:

a relay arrangement for routing the data for transmission over the wireless carrier network (i.e., wireless connector system 878), and a firewall arrangement (i.e., firewall 808) that provides security for the data, the server arrangement (i.e., message server 820) and the relay arrangement (page 15, par. 0132-0137), wherein the relay

arrangement is arranged behind the firewall arrangement and is configured to push the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one handheld wireless device in a non-persistent manner with respect to data being stored outside of the firewall arrangement while enroute to the wireless carrier network (i.e., note that data is never stored outside the firewall 808)(page 10, par. 84-88).

Regarding claims 2, 11, and 33, Little discloses wherein the data includes at least one of e-mail data and PIM data (page 15, par. 0136-0137).

Regarding claims 3, 9, and 13, Little discloses wherein the at least one handheld wireless device receives encryption data wirelessly (pages 2-3, par. 0022-0033).

Regarding claim 4, Little discloses wherein the database includes at least one of an e-mail server (i.e., message server 720) and a database server (i.e., data store 717)(page 14, par. 0124-0128).

Regarding claims 10 and 12, Little discloses a method for transmitting data, comprising:

storing data in a database, retrieving the at least one data from the database via a server arrangement, processing the data in the server arrangement, sending the data to a relay arrangement, processing the data in the relay arrangement arranged behind a firewall arrangement and pushing the data from the relay arrangement from behind the

firewall arrangement to the at least one handheld wireless device in a non-persistent manner with respect to data being stored outside of the firewall arrangement while enroute to the wireless carrier network (i.e., note that data is never stored outside the firewall 808)(page 10, par. 84-88), the firewall arrangement providing security for the data, the server arrangement and the relay arrangement receiving the data at the at least one wireless carrier network, processing the data in the at least one wireless carrier network, sending the data to the at least one handheld wireless device, receiving the data at the at least one handheld wireless device, and processing the data in the handheld wireless device (pages 10-11, par. 0102-0108).

Regarding claims 14 and 24, Little discloses an apparatus to route data for transmission over a wireless carrier network, comprising:

a first arrangement to relay data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement to at least one wireless device that receives data from a wireless carrier network, the first arrangement configured to be arranged behind a firewall arrangement that provides security for the data (page 15, par. 0132-0137), the server arrangement and the first arrangement wherein the first arrangement is configured to push the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless device in a non-persistent manner with respect to data being stored outside of the firewall arrangement while enroute to the wireless carrier network (i.e., note that data is never stored outside the firewall 808)(page 10, par. 84-88).

Regarding claims 15 and 26, Little discloses a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database to at least one wireless device, comprising:
a relay arrangement to route the data for transmission over a wireless carrier network, the relay arrangement configured to communicate with the at least one wireless device via a firewall arrangement that provides security for the data and the relay arrangement (page 15, par. 0132-0137), wherein the relay arrangement is configured to push the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless device in a non-persistent manner with respect to data being stored outside of the firewall arrangement while enroute to the wireless carrier network (i.e., note that data is never stored outside the firewall 808)(page 10, par. 84-88).

Regarding claims 22 and 30, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement includes at least two parts, at least one of which shares a common hardware platform with the server arrangement (page 15, par. 0132-0137 and page 11, par. 0107).

Regarding claims 23, and 28-29, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to route the data over the wireless carrier network (page 15, par. 0132-0137).

Regarding claims 25, 27, and 31, Little discloses wherein the first arrangement is

configured to transmit the data to a particular one of the at least one wireless device only when the particular wireless device is available to receive the data (page 11, par. 0105-0106).

Regarding claim 32, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to store the data if the at least one wireless device is not available to receive the data (page 11, par. 0105-0106).

Regarding claim 39, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to communicate with the wireless carrier network (page 15, par. 0132-0137).

Regarding claim 40, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to convert the data according to a data packet protocol associated with the wireless carrier network (page 2, par. 27).

Regarding claim 41, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to provide the data to plurality of device types over a plurality of wireless carrier network types (page 2, par. 28).

Regarding claim 43, Little discloses wherein the data is routing directly to the wireless carrier network via the Internet (page 2, par. 22-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5-8 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0171369 and Little hereinafter), in view of Bommareddy et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,039 and Bommareddy hereinafter).

Teachings of Little with respect to limitation of claims 1, 10, and 14 have been discussed previously.

Regarding claims 5 and 7, Little does not expressly disclose a redundant server arrangement for the server arrangement.

However, Bommareddy discloses a redundant server arrangement for the server arrangement (col. 2, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the certificate management method and system of Little by including a redundant server arrangement for the server arrangement as disclosed by Bommareddy. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the

suggestion of Bommareddy to improve both reliability and scalability of operations in comparison to single server operation (Bommareddy, col. 2, lines 1-10).

Regarding claims 6 and 8, Little does not expressly disclose a redundant relay arrangement for the relay arrangement.

However, Bommareddy discloses a redundant relay arrangement for the relay arrangement (i.e., clustering units)(col. 5, lines 33-67 and col. 6, lines 10-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the certificate management method and system of Little by including a redundant relay arrangement for the relay arrangement as disclosed by Bommareddy. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Bommareddy to avoid difficulties that arise with a single point of failure (Bommareddy, col. 2, lines 57-65).

Regarding claims 19-21, Little does not expressly disclose further comprising: monitoring the relay arrangement including the routing of the data from the relay arrangement.

However, Bommareddy discloses further comprising: monitoring the relay arrangement including the routing of the data from the relay arrangement (col. 6, lines 30-67 and col. 7, lines 1-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the certificate management method and system of Little by including monitoring the relay arrangement including the routing of the data from the relay arrangement as disclosed by Bommareddy. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Bommareddy to improve both reliability and scalability of operations in comparison to single server operation (Bommareddy, col. 2, lines 1-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 10, 15, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for "routing the data", does not reasonably provide enablement for "pushing the data". The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The specification does not provide support for the system, method, and apparatus claimed in the instant application to specifically "configure the relay arrangement to PUSH the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one handheld wireless device".

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (571) 272-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.S.

Patent Examiner
Group 2131
September 5, 2006

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100